

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/768,024	HARCOURT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jessica L. Rossi	1733	

All Participants:

(1) Jessica L. Rossi.

(2) Mr. Mitchell.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 September 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Examiner called Applicant's attorney to discuss claim 25 because it appeared from the remarks dated 7/11/05 that the claim language "supplying gas through said woven cloth, into said tube, and through the mandrel" was being interpreted too narrowly by Applicant. The examiner explained that even though the present invention discloses passing the gas through the woven cloth by passing the gas from an area outside the exterior surface of the cloth to an area that is adjacent the interior surface of the cloth (Figure 1a - note cloth 101 and gas supply cup 124), the present claim language does not exclude supplying gas through only the interior of the woven cloth, as taught by the prior art of record (see paragraphs 6, 14 and 18 of previous action). Applicant's attorney agreed with examiner's interpretation of the claim language and therefore agreed to amend claim 25 to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record (see examiner's amendment).